



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 1, 1879

VOL. V

NEW YORK, JANUARY 13, 1912

No. 11

The annual meeting of The Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, held at Columbia University, December 2 and 3, 1911, had a peculiar interest for teachers of the Classics, especially in New York City.

In speaking on the topic *How to Increase Educational Efficiency*, Dr. Wm. H. Maxwell, Superintendent of Schools in New York City, in a very thoughtful address, stated that three reforms would do more than any others toward promoting the result sought. These were, so he said, simplified spelling, professional schools for the training of High School teachers, with a course of at least two years, and a radical change in examinations. It is this last proposition which, if carried out, promises to bring about a decided change for the better in the teaching of the Classics. Dr. Maxwell divided his proposed change into two parts: (1) the establishment of both pass- and honor-examinations in languages and mathematics, and (2) the abolition of the present divided examinations in favor of a comprehensive examination at the end of the High School course. In support of his contention, he reminded his hearers that students are differently gifted, that some naturally excel in languages, while others have a mathematical or scientific bent, and argued that therefore it would seem unfair to demand the same knowledge in all subjects from every student, and that a pass-examination would make it possible for every one to take Latin with profit, and so terminate the present unsatisfactory condition as a result of which many students after having started Latin find the task beyond their strength and give up after two or three years, if not sooner. For—and this is especially interesting in view of conditions in New York City High Schools—Dr. Maxwell stated in so many words that he was strongly in favor of every High School student taking Latin *and, if possible, Greek*.

The second part of his proposed reform he supported by the statement that under the present system of conducting examinations, which splits the Latin test into four or five examinations, each capable of being taken independently of all the others, we are fostering cramming for the test under the guidance of the teacher, instead of encouraging the student to undertake an independent review of his

own; he urged also that the student now has, in consequence, the feeling that, the examination once passed, he is entitled to forget all about the subject thus removed from his ken and memory.

To my great regret the discussion which followed did not touch on these propositions at all, perhaps because most of us were startled by their radicalism. Undoubtedly, opinions will be much divided in regard to these reforms. But coming from so prominent a source, they will as undoubtedly provoke much discussion. The present writer believes that ultimately they will be adopted, and he hails the boldness of Dr. Maxwell in breaking with custom all the more heartily as to him they savor of the remembrances of his own youth.

It may not be unprofitable to try to start the discussion in these columns by an adumbration of an examination under such a system as Dr. Maxwell proposes. In the first place, it would presumably include few 'seen' or 'prepared' passages from the school authors, because that would mean too great a stress on the memory, and would thus produce, rather than check, cramming. In other words, sight translation would receive a powerful stimulus, sight translation, that is, which is much more than a mere contest in guessing, marked by the examiner with a pitying smile and corresponding leniency. The sight examination, I imagine, would also be made the basis of the grammar examination, since it seems childish to teach that the ability to read any Latin passage rests on the accurate observation of forms, word or clause relation, and derivation, and at the same time rigidly to bar all attempts to test this accurate knowledge in any way except by translation. The prose composition test, on the other hand, will presumably be based on those portions of the text which were read and analyzed in school, and it will largely take the form of 'retroversion'.

The character of the pass-examination, at least, will probably be very simple, so as to put the work within the power of the average student; but on the other hand, the rating will be much more strict than at present, and a higher standard will be expected, even though, as we hope, it will not be expressed in per centum fractions. The honor examination, while based on the same principles, will in all likelihood consist of more difficult passages and

more searching questions. Lastly, a special and supplementary examination will be set in both cases to test the student's knowledge of subject matter, antiquities, and, in the honor examination, of his literary appreciation.

These remarks are offered for what they are worth in the hope of provoking an exhaustive discussion of Dr. Maxwell's startlingly revolutionary proposals. Vivant sequentes!

ERNST RIESS.

THE STRUCTURE OF CICERO'S ORATIO PRO LEGE MANILIA¹

In this speech, as is well known, Cicero used all the technical devices of rhetoric taught by the Greek and the Roman theorists. As an example of argumentative oratory it is notable, not only in classical, but in all literature. An analysis of it will disclose the means by which its structure has been wrought out, and will suggest comparison with other pieces of argumentation. The American schoolboy while reading this speech will gain practical help by carrying the results of his work upon it over into his study of, say, Burke's Conciliation with America. Similarities and contrasts will constantly inspire the student who carefully handles specimens of oratory in the two languages.

Suggestive exercises can be planned also for comparison with the other speeches of Cicero. Standing as the preeminent example of its type, the *genus deliberativum* or argumentative oratory, the Manilian Law invites comparison as a whole and for literary finish with his best speeches of the other two types; for example, with the Second Philippic, the *genus laudativum* or personal oratory of eulogy and invective and with certain of the speeches against Verres, the *genus iudiciale* or legal oratory.

The care with which the structure has been elaborated is a natural result of Cicero's theory, which he announced in his early work, *De Inventione* I. 33. In this treatise, belonging perhaps to the year 84 B. C., he lays down the rule that the division of a subject (*partitio*) and the discussion of it (*tractatio*) should follow the same order. Indeed, this doctrine became a commonplace of Roman rhetoric and is stated with even more emphasis by Quintilian 4, 5-28.

Cicero gives a decided and full *partitio* in only seven of his speeches: *Pro Quinctio* (81 B. C.), *Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino* (80), *In Verrem, Actio 2*, 3 *De Frumento* (70), *De Imperio Cn. Pompei* (66), *Pro Cluentio* (66), *Pro Murena* (63), *Philippica 7* (43). These dates are of interest for the development of Cicero's art and as related to his earliest rhetorical theories published in his *De Inventione* (84 B. C.?). In no other speech, however, is the structure so carefully elaborated as in the Manilian Law. A brief statement and the outline at the end of this article will serve to show the pains

Cicero bestowed upon the mere mechanics of structure in this particular speech.

After a short introduction, dealing with his previous career and his present opportunity, Cicero foreshadows the goal of his entire speech in 3. He next puts vividly before his hearers the present grave crisis in Asia Minor. He starts his positive argument by an appeal to meet this crisis intelligently, dividing this part of his speech into three heads and dividing the first further into four subheads.

He then proceeds (7) to discuss these divisions in due order. When he reaches the third point, he has come to the heart of his proposition (27), the choice of a commander to meet the crisis. After a preliminary statement to show the inevitableness of choosing Pompey (27; cf. 3 as enhanced by this second insistence on Pompey), a discussion of the ideal qualities of a commander (a sort of *locus communis*) is begun (28) by dividing the subject into four heads. In the treatment of these four topics the general aspect and the specific illustration from Pompey's career go hand in hand; the discussion is not purely academic. In 29 Cicero has reached another important stage in the course of his argument; *virtus* in all its phases and its manifold values is necessary to cope with the enemies of the Republic. How Pompey meets these requirements is viewed from two aspects; he is considered as a general and as a man. His merits as a general are illustrated in 29-35 by a series of striking scenes, which put before us Pompey's strenuous career for the previous twenty years.

Another *partitio* occurs in exhibiting Pompey's noble traits of personality. Naturally this is the most complicated passage in the speech. This is evidently meant as a genuine *partitio*: note *primum*, *deinde*, and the discussion which corresponds, beginning with 37. But the order of discussion is unexpectedly not the order of division: the topic *fides*, fidelity, is out of its place, either in 36 or in 42.

After closing the discussion of Pompey's merits and excellences as a man, Cicero deals with the two remaining topics under choosing a commander: *auctoritas*, prestige (43), and *felicitas*, success (47). The whole of the positive argument, *confirmatio*, is closed by a summary, in which Cicero drives home with enhanced force the statements of 3 and 27 by reminding his audience of the steps by which they had unfaithfully come to the one conclusion possible. The argument in rebuttal (51) and the final appeal and summary (60) easily and consistently round out the speech.

Thus the framework and the joints of the speech are clearly evident. But one other feature of Cicero's handling must be noticed—the use of connecting phrases, *transitio*. Cicero pays heed to this linking process in his *Pro Murena* and his *Philippica 7*, as well as in the Manilian Law. But in the elab-

¹ See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 4, 202.

C. K.